

REMARKS

A number of claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,600,775 issued to King et al that describes a method and apparatus for annotation full motion video. More specifically, King provides for the annotation of full motion digital video frames without modifications to the original video information (at Abstract) separately storing the annotations and video information and, during playback, the annotations are displayed on the original frames.

In contrast, the invention describes a video presentation tool kit for annotating a **portion** of a video frame by modifying the video frame content corresponding to the designated video frame portion. In this way, there is no requirement to separately store and retrieve the annotations during playback as mandated by King. More specifically, claim 1 recites,

"A video presentation tool kit for creating an annotated video presentation formed of a number of linearly associated video frames each having associated video frame content; comprising:

a user activated designation tool for designating at least a portion of at least one of the number of video frames;

an annotator tool for annotating the designated video frame portion by optionally modifying the video frame content corresponding to the designated video frame portion; and

an authoring tool arranged to provide additional effects to enhance the video content modifications of the designated video frame portion."

Therefore in contrast to King, the invention as recited in claim 1 as amended teaches a tool kit for annotating portions of video frames by modifying the video frame content of the designated portions.

Accordingly, the Applicant believes that King does not anticipate nor reasonably suggest the invention as recited in claim 1 and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the U.S.C. 102(b) rejection thereof.

Independent claim 15 as amended teaches a system that recites limitation similar in scope to independent claim 1 and is therefore also allowable.

All dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and/or 15 and are therefore also allowable for at least the reasons stated for claims 1 and 15 above.

The Examiner also rejected a number of other claims as being obvious under King in view of Official Notice (at page 5, second paragraph) and as being obvious under King in view of U.S. Patent 6,507,696 issued to Chung as well as King in view of Chung and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,375 issued to Jain. Since none of the cited references (nor the Official Notice) adds to King with regards to the claimed limitations of the invention. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the secondary references fail to cure the deficiencies of Abecassis and request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness type rejections thereof.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
650-961-8300